

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ADVANCED MICRO DEVICES, INC., et  
al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

LG ELECTRONICS, INC., et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. [14-cv-01012-SI](#)

**ORDER DENYING MSILICON'S  
MOTION TO QUASH**

Re: Dkt. No. 235

The Court is in receipt of a joint letter from plaintiffs Advanced Micro Devices, Inc. and ATI Technologies ULC (“AMD”) and non-party MSilicon Technology Corp. (“MSilicon”). Dkt. No. 235. MSilicon is a San Jose-based subsidiary of MStar Semiconductor, Inc. (“MStar”), a Taiwanese entity that designs computer chips utilized in many of the LG devices accused of infringement in this case. MSilicon seeks to quash AMD’s deposition subpoena, arguing that MStar, LG, or another entity is the more appropriate party from which to seek this discovery. MSilicon argues that compliance with AMD’s subpoena would subject it to undue burden and expense, and that MSilicon likely does not have possession of any relevant information.

The Court has reviewed the parties’ joint submission in detail and DENIES MSilicon’s request. MSilicon, whose “principal business relates to promotion, marketing, and customer support of certain of (but not all of) MStar chips in North, Central, and South America[.]” likely has responsive information to at least some of AMD’s deposition topics. If MSilicon truly lacked any relevant information, it should have made that representation under oath, as opposed to in a discovery letter. Under these circumstances, the Court finds that providing the subpoenaed

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

depositions will not subject MSilicon to undue burden or expense. Accordingly, MSilicon's motion to quash is **DENIED**.

This order resolves Dkt. No. 235.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: August 21, 2017



---

SUSAN ILLSTON  
United States District Judge